DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 294 JC 790 474

AUTHOR Belock, Shirley
TITLE A Proposed Alternative to the Decision Making Structure at Castleton State College.
PUB DATE 14 Jan 79
NOTE 37p.; Ed. D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; *College Administration; *College Governing Councils; Decision Making; *Governance; *Higher Education; *Policy Formation; State Colleges; Student Participation; Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

In an effort to realize greater representation of all constituencies in college governance and decision-making, a proposal was developed to establish an All-College Senate at Castleton State College. The proposal was prepared after a review of the college's current governance system and of relevant literature, and meeting with interested groups on campus. The proposal itself is presented in the form of a constitution for the All-College Senate. The proposed Senate is composed of 12 elected representatives from all major constituencies of the college--administration, faculty, students, staff, non-contract personnel, and alumni. According to the Constitution, the Senate will assist in the deliberation of issues and policies and will make recommendations to the college president in those areas that affect the college community as a whole, including budgetary matters and institutional planning. Excluded from consideration shall be matters relating to collective bargaining negotiation and certain student government activities. It is recommended that a one-year trial period be established for the Senate, during which time no structural or membership changes will be made, and all deliberations and decisions can be evaluated. It is further recommended that the Senate should prepare a Bill of Rights for all campus constituencies. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED174294

A PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE TO THE DECISION MAKING STRUCTURE AT CASTLETON STATE COLLEGE

by

Shirley Belock, M.A.

Castleton State College
Castleton, Vermont

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Shirley Belock

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 790 474

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULLFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

JANUARY 14, 1979

A PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE TO THE DECISION MAKING STRUCTURE AT CASTLETON STATE COLLEGE

By

Shirley Belock

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to propose an alternative to the governance and decision making structure at Castleton State College. The alternative was the formation of an All College Senate. The Senate would include representatives from all major constituencies of the college. Representation was from administration, faculty, students, staff, non contract personnel, and alumni. Duties of the Senate would be to assist in the deliberation of issues and policies and the making of recommendations to the college president in those areas that would effect the college community as a whole. The formation of the Senate was significant because there would than be a greater sharing of governance on campus. Most decisions would be made through the combined efforts of all groups, rather than by the two strongest groups on campus as has been the situation, i.e., faculty and administration. The proposal was prepared after completion of a review of the college's current governance system, current pertinent literature, and meetings with major factions on campus. Steps for implementation of the proposal have been included. Recommendations included: Deliberations and decisions should move more slowly and deliberatly during the initial year as it would be a learning/evaluating process; no changes of number of representatives or membership should be made for the first year; and, the Senate should prepare a bill of rights for all campus constituencies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	3
	SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	5
	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	5
3.	PROCEDURE	16
4.	RESULTS	18
	ALL COLLEGE SENATE PROPOSAL	23
5.	DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	26
REFERENCES CITED		32

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to propose an alternative to the governance and decision making process at Castleton State College. Since the faculty unionized in 1974, the decision making process has been primarily between two groups: The faculty and the administration. Students and other groups making up the college community have played a small, limited role in the campus governance process. Thus, resulting in the fact that they have had little input into decisions that ultimately affect them.

The faculty unionized because of the financial situation. This situation reached a state of crisis in 1974, resulting in lay offs in all areas except faculty. The financial situation has not significantly improved since 1974. Staff and other services remain at the minimum level necessary to keep the college open and functioning. Some departments have continued without adequate secretarial or clerical help, being forced to rely on work/study students to answer phones, type, and do other needed clerical work. Due to the inexperience of work/study students, the quality of their work has usually been at an unsatisfactory level.

Student services continue to be curtailed. Tuition, board and room prices have increased well above the national average. Also, there has recently been a strong indication that tuition may again be raised to offset the affects of inflation.

Students do have an organization: The Student Association. However, the organization has been weak with few students actively participating.

The student organization primarily concerns itself with those matters pertaining to student life in dormitories.

Students have been included in all Faculty Assembly committees, except for those dealing directly with the faculty, e.g., Promotion and Tenure Committee. On most committees, however, students' attendance and input has been sporatic, reflecting the inaffectiveness of their participation. Any efforts by students to bring about change have been affectively diluted through the process of faculty having more numbers and votes on all committees.

The intent of this study was to propose an alternative to the decision making structure at Castleton State College, i.e., an All College Senate. The Senate would include members from the main factions on campus so all groups would have a voice in campus affairs. Representation would come from faculty, students, administration, non contract personnel, and alumni. The function of the Senate would be to assist the president in making those decisions that affect the whole college community.

Through the formation of the All College Senate a climate would be created where authority and decision making would be shared. Thus, decisions would than be made through the combined efforts of all constituencies, rather than by the two strongest groups currently on campus, i.e., the administration and faculty.

Chapter 2

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Castleton State College is a small liberal arts college located in rural, southern Vermont. The college has undergone a period of unrest and change in its governance structure. This unrest and change resulted in the faculty adopting collective bargaining and in students becoming uneasy and apathetic, feeling they have no power or voice into those decisions that ultimately affect them.

The present situation has persisted since 1974 when faculty chose collective bargaining. The advent of unionization was primarily due to the lack of funds for the state wide college system, of which Castleton State College was a member. Faculty feared that lack of funds would cause a reduction in teaching personnel, which would increase their teaching responsibilities, prevent salary increases, and produce cuts in special programs and activities. Prior to unionization, faculty had little input into the governance or decision making process of the college. Governance was one of a bureaucratic structure as described by Richardson and Bender (1974:36). The president of the college was the major decision maker, answerable only to the Board of Trustees. Communications were one way, i.e., from the president downward. After several unpopular administrative decisions were handed down where no recourse was possible faculty believed they had no choice but to unionize (Chaloux, 1975).

Major personnel layoffs during the resulting period of unrest and financial crisis came in the area of staff and middle management. Individuals

released were at the discretion of the president without any input or recourse from either faculty or staff. Attempts by the staff to unionize were inaffective, apparently because of successful counter measures by the president and other administrators.

The financial situation has not significantly improved since 1974. Staff and other services have remained at the austerity level. The few additions of personnel have been in the administrative area and many departments continue to function without adequate secretarial or clerical help. These departments must continue to rely on work/study students to answer phones, take messages, type and accomplish other clerical work, which unfortunately, has been usually unsatisfactory.

Student services were curtailed drastically during the crisis. Few have been restored, creating a dissatisfied, but apathetic student body. Tuition, board and room rates were increased and have remained well above the national average for similar public institutions. The Board of Trustees recently indicated that tuition would again have to be increased due to the continued financial problems confronting the state college system.

Students in the college have an organization: The Student Association. However, the organization appears weak with few students interested or actively participating. The organization functions primarily with those matters pertaining to student life on campus. These activities center around dormitory residents, rarely including the commuting students.

Students were invited to join and participate in Faculty Assembly committees. However, students' attendance and participation has been sporatic at best and in all committees students are out numbered by faculty. Thus, through the process of greater numbers, faculty affectively dilute or

block any effort by students to bring about change.

Other groups with an interest in college affairs such as evening students, alumni, and non academic personnel have no voice in the decision making process or governance functions of the college.

Significance of the study

The president of the college indicated recently that he finds the present structure of college governance difficult and cumbersome to work with. Faculty committees have proliferated to the point where effort and jurisdiction have been duplicated. Thus resulting in a situation that was not only confusing, but also incapable of assisting the president to make informed decisions; deal with campus wide problems; and, with changing institutional conditions forced by internal and external pressures.

The executive council of the Faculty Assembly recognized the problem and in a memo dated March 1, 1978 requested that faculty review the existing structure and offer suggestions to solve the dilemma. This study was an attempt to meet the challenge. The formation of a college wide senate would be a solution to the existing problem.

The All College Senate would create a climate where authority would be shared by all constituencies on campus. Thus, most decisions would be made through the combined efforts of all groups, rather than by the two strongest groups on campus to the detriment of others. Currently the two strongest groups on campus are the administration and the faculty.

Review of literature

As colleges and universities have grown and evolved into specific disciplines and departments, they were subjected to outside influences and political pressures. To meet these pressures the governance of colleges

had to change. However, the forced change caused confusion. As Kerr observed, campuses soon had no clear theory of governance. College governance developed to the point where it was partly collegial and partly heirarchial in nature. Than in early 1970 collective bargaining became a force that created a complete change in college environments (Mortimer and McConnel, 1978).

With the advent of unions on campus, decision making became more adversarial, even though faculty continued to give lip service to the collegial model. Decisions were often no more than negotiated compromises between the competing groups. Included were not only the internal groups found on campuses, but also external interest groups which exerted strong influence over the decision making process, e.g., state legislatures and the federal government (Riley and Baldridge, 1977).

Few individuals, other than the administration, were actively involved in the governance of institutions or the decision making process. Riley and Baldridge (1977) cited that most individuals most of the time found the policy making process an uninteresting, unrewarding activity and therefore, preferred to leave the process to a few individuals and administrators (p. 14). Most of the other participants moved in and out of the decision making process, with those few who persisted usually making most of the decisions. Riley and Baldridge further opined that there was a great differentiation in participation. A few actives participated a great deal; a large group constitutes an alert and informed public and participated a modest amount; the largest groups, however, were those who were not interested nor informed and participated very little (p. 71). In fact Mortimer and McConnell (1978:37) cited that of the institutions they studied only twenty to thirty-five percent of eligible faculty actively served on committees or took part in the affairs of the institution.

Part time participation has tended to make the decision making process difficult and even inefficient. Each group participated only when the decisions under discussion affected them or their discipline. Thus, the decision making process became cumbersome and complex, depending upon the priorties of the involved groups (Riley and Baldridge, 1977).

Participation by faculty in the governance procedure was minimal but a general view from other groups in the colleges were that the faculty got what they wanted, and students 'don't give a damn', a fact that Helsabeck (1973) found not too difficult to understand in light of the ambiguous and unproductive results usually found on most campuses (p. 92).

Faculty participation has been generally one of consultation to the administration, with little shared authority and no faculty power. However, a typical conclusion from other interest groups on campus was that the governance was the type where authority was shared by faculty and administration, with little participation by students, non teaching professionals and clerical staffs.

Students appear to be very weak and inaffective in college governance, perhaps because they are new to the scene. When the 1960s began, very few colleges or universities involved students in the decision making process. However, by the end of the 1960s it had become a political activity. Students were able to formalize their access to and their participation in academic governance. Students' influence was predominately exercised through formal participation in committees and other academic decision making bodies (Riley and Baldridge, 1977:240).

In recent years students' influence in college governance has waned. Factors that may have caused this reduction were 1) general apathy of

students; 2) rising interest in career programs due to the economic recession; 3) an increase in the control of colleges and universities by states. Thus causing major decisions to be made many miles away from campus in arenas where students would have very little influence; 4) the advent of faculty unionization which prevented students' influence. The faculty had taken much of the decision making power away from the administration and were most certainly not going to share it with students. In fact, collective bargaining agreements ignored the students' voice and role they had gained in the 1960s (Riley and Baldridge, 1977:XV).

As faculties unionized the governance model of campuses became a political one. In most agreements no adequate procedure was included for students' involvement in decisions that affected them (Blocker, Bender, and Martorana, 1975; Richardson and Bender, 1974). Thus, in a political environment, students were the weakest groups. They were weak because they lacked experiences, resources, broad interests, and, most importantly, seldom had access to channels of communication needed to be knowledgeable in a political decision making process.

Even in cases where collective bargaining has included students, their participation was futile and cumbersome. Howes and Hugo (1974) believed that students' participation was too time consuming for others. Students would have to be briefed on those issues requiring a solid background before they could adequately deal with them. The situation was further aggravated because students would than believe they were not able to deal with the issues and the faculty, and therefore, would soon lack the motivation to attend or participate in committee meetings.

Hodgkinson (1971) identified other arguments against students' participation. These arguments included that students were too young,

too self-interested, too naive' in the governance process, and were only around for a short period of time to be affective. He believed that student bodies were too diverse and, thus, could not be represented by one or two students in joint faculty/student endeavors (p. 4).

Blocker, Bender, and Martorana (1976) cited that in most instances the principle motivation of students was to complete degree requirements for a career, and to achieve economic security with reasonable social status. They suggested that students were motivated to be involved only when circumstances threatened them to the point where they believed there was a need to attack the system. At other times students' feelings were usually ones of apathy. With few exceptions, Mortimer (1976) believes, students become involved only when they can muster political resources to demand attention, otherwise they could be and were frequently ignored.

Strengths of students' participation were also discussed. Balderson (1974) cited that students' participation would provide a new dimension into those problems and decisions that affect them. In fact, Brubacker (1977) believed that students should be consulted on all decisions that concerned them. Students, as consumers of higher education, were more concerned with the quality of teaching than were either faculty or administration. Also, students want to influence decisions on curriculum matters, as well as on the appointment, promotion and dismissal of faculty (Brubacker, 1977; Carnegie Commission, 1974).

Students believe they should control all regulations that involve their lives and behavior, the activities fees, the use of facilities for those off campus activities invited to campus, and the development of procedures for handling student grievances against faculty members. Millet (1978) cites that to deny them a voice has been to eliminate an "opportunity

to affectively participate or influence actions that were of great importance to them (p. 215)."

Students considered the campus as their community and, thus, should be involved in all decisions. As Enerson (1977) cited;

> They must share in the decisions that so profoundly affect the quality of their lives, opportunities, futures. They feel helpless in a system that too often ignores their needs and deepest concerns . . . . Those who have the most at stake are patronizingly pushed to the outer edges of policy making. Real power is tantalizingly beyond their reach (p. 48).

By being in the decision making processes, students can have a chance to affect change and to learn how to make important, long lasting decisions. Shaffer (1970:344) suggested that students need the legitimacy and learning that can come only by handling real power and by having their decisions honored without condensation. He considered that participation was important and was a learning process for future post educational experiences in community living.

The Carnegie Commission (1974) concurred with Shaffer, believing that the majority of students do want to participate in the governance structure and would add to the information needed in assisting to make quality judgements.

The short time students are on campus has been an argument against student participation in key areas. However, Hodgkinson (1971) refutes this logic. He cited that presidents of colleges stay an average of five years and faculty frequently leave for other positions or were on sabbaticals. In fact, he believed students were many times members of the campus community as long, or even longer, than many of the individuals making up other groups on campus.

In recent attempts to reduce the attrition rate of students, Astin (1978) cited there would be a greater retention of students if they were

actively involved in campus organizations and would interact frequently with faculty and other students. Astin opined that students living off campus drop out more frequently because they spend less time on campus. He believed this occurred because commuting students' lives were concerned primarily with persons and events outside of the educational institution (p. 21). By actively including students in the decision making process, students would be positively influenced and would become more interested and interesting learners. This fact was emphasized by Skinner (1977) when he stated "positively reinforced behavior was active participation in life (p. 80)."

A joint statement formulated in 1966 by The American Association of University Professors, The American Council of Education, and The Association of Governing Boards cited that shared authority was an ideal which colleges and universities should strive for and should be based upon a community interest including the governing board, administration, faculty, students and other groups (Mortimer and McConnell, 1978:4).

Weaver (1977) proposed that a more participative group model of governance would help institutions to meet their goals and to excel through team work and cooperation. He emphasized that if faculty and administrators continued to isolate themselves than an atmosphere of college wide team work and cooperation could not exist. Thus, misperceptions would be intensified, resulting in a lack of trust in the campus community. Thereby undermining a true living/learning environment that should be continually strived for.

Underlying campus wide governance was the assumption that if faculty members, students, academic administration and other groups were brought together, better decisions could be produced. Campus wide governance was important because communications would be encouraged within the academic community (Millet, 1978).

Some writers identified major flaws in shared authority governance. Mortimer and McConnell (1978) cited that shared authority would ignore conflicts of interest, adversarial decision making practices, and would not take into account external forces but would almost exclusively focus on internal campus affairs. They believed that most threats to departmental, college and campus autonomy, and patterns of governance were generated by external forces and developments, not by internal problems and issues (p. 270).

Another problem identified in a shared governance model was that faculty unions would strongly out perform it in areas of economic matters, particularly faculty salary, promotion and working conditions. Riley and Baldridge (1977) believed that shared authority would mainly influence academic issues such as degree requirements and curriculum.

Desmarais and Wiggins (1975) opined that these flaws could be overcome, citing Brookdale Community College as an example. Brookdale Community College identified the following principles of a shared governance system. Shared governance would: 1) Represent all major college constituencies including not only students, administrators and faculty, but also the non academic staff, secretaries, groundskeepers and paraprofessionals. 2) The establishment of shared governance would not turn the college into a miniature democracy. The existing powers of student government would be left intact, including its power to allocate student activities funds among approved college organizations. 3) Matters subject to negotiations between the college as employer, and the staff and faculty as employees, would be excluded from the legislative decision making power. 4) The structure of the governance system would be consistent with and even enhance the college's approach to learning (p. 10-11).

In identifying how various shared governance models were structured the literature indicated the trend was either formation of a senate or a

president's council. In most instances the formation of such a council or senate did not replace or eliminate faculty or student organizations but were conducted concurrently with them. The duties, charges, and deliberations for the senate or president's council were different than those pursued by other campus organizations. In fact, Chalick, et al (1974) cited that the primary duty of a senate or president's council should be the preparation of a bill of rights for all groups or constituencies on campus (p. 12).

Millet (1978:256) suggested that the senate or president's council should consider the following three areas: 1) Discussion of any actions initiated by either faculty or student associations that the college president might refer for further consideration. 2) Recommendation to the president policies and procedures involving support programs of the institution. 3) Reviewing institutional plans and budgets as submitted by the president.

Weaver (1977) believed that college governance should encompass a wide range of interpersonal variables such as leadership, motivation, increasing communication, decision making, interaction and goal setting within the college community as a whole (p. 4). Most important, however, any college governance should be based upon mutual trust and cooperation among all constituents. According to Mortimer and McConnell (1978) an adversarial relationship would prevent open interaction and communication which would be crucial to affective planning and decision making.

The formation of a college senate or president's council should include representation from all groups interested in campus affairs and governance. These groups included administration, faculty, students, non contract personnel such as secretaries and maintenance employees, alumni

and in some instances trustees (Millet, 1978; Mortimer and McConnell, 1978; Wyman, 1974).

Riley and Baldridge (1977:209) proposed the use of the following criteria when identifying and realigning governance and authority on campus: 1) The structure of the senate or council must reflect a genuine commitment to enfranchise those constituencies or groups that previously had been under, or not, represented. 2) The design must foster cooperation of each constituency and to further contributions from those groups having special competencies. 3) The system must provide for a division of labor between policy making and management. 4) The existance of diverse groups with often conflicting interests and perspectives must not imply that all fundamental policy making would become a process of groups negotiations, i.e., of collective bargaining, compromise, and accommodation. 5) The process must be flexible to meet rapidly changing external and internal changes that affect the educational institution.

In determining how members of the council or senate would be selected most writers opined that representatives should be either elected or appointed by their constituencies (Chalick, et al, 1974; Desmarais and Wiggins, 1975; Millet, 1978; Shaffer, 1970). No matter what process of selection was used the selection must be in a truly democratic fashion because the representatives must have a sense of legitimacy so their decisions and suggestions would be honored throughout the campus community.

In the formation of the campus wide senate the balance between members was most important. For instance, if the number of faculty representatives exceeds the number of students, than the students' voice may not be heard because faculty members would be able to out vote students or other groups, which would than turn the senate into another faculty committee.

Millet (1978) suggested a solution to prevent this from happening. He suggested that the senate or council should be made up of the following ratio: Forty percent faculty selected by the faculty association; forty percent student representation selected by the student association; twenty percent administrative or support personnel selected by the president. The president would preside over all meetings.

Millet also gave an example of what had occurred at a western college. Eastern Montana College has a small academic council chaired by the academic vice president. The group was made up of three elected faculty members, three students and three administrators. No other groups were included. All members were either employed full time or were full time students. Part time faculty and students were not represented. Desmarais and Wiggins (1975) and Chalick, et al (1976) believed that if part time individuals, particularly students were not included in the governance structure of the college than the largest constituency on the campus had been disenfranchized. Thus, their needs, concerns and input into decisions that affected them were not considered.

Chalick, et al further cited that all factions of the student body should have representation and should be able to attend meetings at least part of the time. In order to meet the needs of those having other commitments, e.g., family or employment responsibilities, meeting times must be flexible and be rotated between days and evenings so that all representatives would be able to attend the meetings at least part of the time.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURE

Preliminary steps

Preliminary steps before preparing the proposal included a review of pertinent literature; a review of Castleton State College's current governance structure; and, meetings with major factions of campus.

The review of literature was conducted to 1) identify types of governance structures presently in use at various higher educational institutions; 2) groups usually included in the membership of the different governance structures; 3) strengths and weaknesses of each type of governance structures; and, 4) tasks undertaken by the various structures.

The review of the current system at Castleton State College included the identification of the present type of governance model, the strongest and weakest groups that interact within the model, and a review of the evolution of the current governance system.

Discussion meetings were scheduled and held with members of the major groups on campus, i.e., administration and faculty, non academic staff, and day and evening students. Topics discussed included 1) problems with the present governance structure; 2) strengths that should be retained; 3) weaknesses and possible methods that would turn them into strengths; 4) the type of governance system the groups might prefer; 5) discussion of the feasibility of an all college senate, i.e., what it was, what it was not, what it can and cannot do; 6) the time involvement for participants; and, 7) strengths and weaknesses of such a system.

Proposal preparation

Preparation of the proposal for an All College Senate was accomplished after completing the preliminary steps. The proposed All College Senate included 1) the purpose of the organization, 2) tasks of the organization, 3) the constituencies that must be represented, 4) the numbers of representatives from each constituency, 5) method of selection of representatives, 6) time and number of meetings for the academic year, 7) officers of the organization, and 8) ammendments to the proposal.

The proposal was prepared in the format of a constitution for the All College Senate.

Implementation

To implement the proposal group meetings would again be scheduled. The meetings would be for the purpose of discussing the proposal, revising sections of the proposal if necessary, and identifying problems and issues that might arise during the selection of representatives and the initial year of operation.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

After reviewing current literature, reviewing the existing governance structure at Castleton State College, and conducting meetings to discuss the feasibility of an All College Senate, the proposal was prepared.

The review of literature identified the types of governance structures in higher educational institutions as bureaucratic, collegial, and political (Riley and Baldridge 1977:9-21). Each structure has definate strengths and weaknesses. Strengths of the collegial model included that all members could be heard and had an equal voice in all decisions; the administration was considered to be there to serve the needs of the faculty so they would be free to teach. Weaknesses identified in the collegial model were that it was inefficient; unable to deal with conflict; unable to meet crisis situations quickly; and educational organizations had become too large and too diverse with few members participating to be truly affective. Students were usually excluded.

Strengths of the bureaucratic model were that such an organization was very efficient having a 'chain of command' clearly formalized with a legitimate power base established; policies and procedures were written for all to see and understand. Weaknesses were that the bureaucratic model does not take into account informal power and influence within the institution. It explained how policies can be carried out but nothing about the process of establishing those policies; the model usually ignored political issues on campus.

The political system was able to deal with conflict, negotiations between groups, and encompassed various campus members. Weaknesses of the political model were that it probably over stressed conflict resolution, with not enough emphasis given to long term decision making processes. The groups were fragmented and in conflict with each other.

The literature favored representation by all major groups on campus. The literature further identified who actually took part in the process and who was usually excluded from the decision making process. To summerize the findings the administration was always actively involved; the faculty moved in and out of the process depending upon their interest in what was under discussion; students were usually included in faculty committees but because of their inexperience and lack of influence rarely participated. Other staff members of the community were rarely considered or included in the process.

Current Castleton State College governance structure evolved from a system that had been bureaucratic in nature. In 1974, the structure precipitously changed when faculty unionized. Thus, changing the governance model from a bureaucratic to a political one. Faculty than became the strongest group. Recently because of lack of financial funds within the college system, power plays have increased between departments and individual faculty, thus unity among this group has begun to dissipate. Administration continues to be strong even though small in numbers.

Student groups have few strengths. Efforts by students with leadership ability are affectively diluted by the apathy of other students and, also, by their inability to influence the faculty and administration. Evening students have been essentially ignored.

Discussion with campus groups were scheduled and held. Salient points made by those attending were that faculty and administration considered students to be inexperienced and ignorant about the decision making process and issues on campus. Some faculty believed students should not have a vote because they did not have the necessary academic background to be considered as 'peers' in the governance structure. However, the majority of faculty did believe students should be heard and should vote because the educational outcome affected them more than any other group on campus. When questioned about non academic personnel, surprisingly most faculty believed their voices should be heard because what they did in most instances related directly to the academic workload.

Faculty considered such an all college senate had merit and were willing to consider the proposal further once it was completed. They were concerned about lack of time for participation because of their heavy teaching schedules and believed the process would take considerable time for research, clarification, discussion and communication with constituencies. Time needed for these responsibilities would be more than a representative could handle unless release time was granted by the president of the college.

Another voiced concern was that faculty believed the senate could become political where each group would be working for its own good with negotiations and concessions occurring during the meetings. Faculty and administration believed this could be controlled by not allowing the senate to become involved in, or with, the collective bargaining unit and excluding those matters negotiated between employer and employee from senate deliberations.

Day and evening students were for such an endeaver believing that they would be able to have some influence through such an organization.

However, fears were expressed that decisions would be made prior to meetings of the senate and thus the organization would become little more than a 'rubber stamp'.

Students were also concerned about the amount of time involved and whether they would be able to arrange necessary class time to attend meetings if they were chosen as their consitituencies representative. Continuing education students suggested that at least one half of the meetings should be held during evening hours so their representatives could attend.

Students also identified their lack of experience and knowledge about the decision making process and the major issues confronting the campus. They believed they would need extra time to discuss, clarify, self educate, research and communicate with other members of the senate on those issues or topics under discussion.

Non academic staff were enthusiastic and because some staff members had served successfully on administrative search committees were willing to undertake extra work to serve.

Preparation of the proposal

Preparation of the proposal was formulated from the review of literature and comments made by the administration, faculty, students, and staff. The proposal was prepared in the format of a constitution for the All College Senate. The proposed constitution has been included on pages 23 through 25.

Implementation

Implementation of the All College Senate proposal after submission of the findings and format to the college president would be as follows:

1) Scheduling of meetings with administration, faculty, day and

evening students, and non academic staff. The meetings would be to communicate the findings and to present the proposal. Discussion and clarification of pertinent points of the proposal and possible problem areas would be identified, discussed and, if possible, resolved.

2) Implementation of the proposal has been planned for the beginning of academic year 1979-80. Therefore, representatives must be selected from the major factions before the end of the spring 1978 semester.

3) The first meeting of the All College Senate would be called during August prior to the beginning of the fall semester. The primary purpose of this meeting would be to orient the representatives to the purposes and goals of the organization and to elect a secretary for the academic year.

4) After the All College Senate has been in operation for one year meetings with major factions would be held. The meetings would be for the purpose of evaluating the organization to determine whether it was accomplishing the intended purpose. If it was not than input would be requested from the college wide campus for possible revisions or solutions to eliminate the identified problems or weaknesses.

Constitution of the All College Senate
Castleton State College

Article I. Name

The name of this organization shall be the All College Senate of Castleton State College.

Article II. Objectives

Section 1: The objectives of the All College Senate shall be to discuss and consider issues and/or policies brought before it by the president or members of the community that are of a college wide concern; to recommend to the president those decisions reached collectively by the All College Senate concerning policies, procedures and issues of a college wide nature; to review budgetary matters and institutional plans as brought forth by the college president; to provide affective contact and communication between and with other major factions on campus; and, to aid in the coordination of goals and activities of all factions toward the common mission and purpose of the college.

Section 2: Excluded from consideration shall be matters subject to negotiations between the college, as employer, and the staff/faculty, as employees; and those student government functions such as allocation of funds for student activities or invitations of entertainment groups to campus.

Article III. Membership

Section 1: Membership shall consist of twelve representatives drawn from the major factions on campus which are administration, faculty, students, non contract staff and alumni. Numbers selected from each group shall consist of one member from the administration; three faculty members, all from different departments; four students, two day and two evening; two non contract staff; and two alumni.

Section 2: Selection of the representatives shall be as follows: Election of representatives for faculty, students, and non contract personnel shall be made by each constituency during the spring semester. The president shall select one representative from the administration and two representatives from the alumni.

Section 3: Term of membership of all representatives shall be for two consecutive years. (Except for the first year. To ensure continuity thereafter, one half of the representatives shall remain in office for only one year.) Representatives shall serve for only one term. At least two years must lapse before an individual can be selected to serve again on the All College Senate.

Section 4: Representatives from faculty and staff shall receive one quarter release time from their duties while serving. Students shall earn three credits per semester and may not enroll for more than twelve credits each semester while serving.

Article IV. Officers

Section 1: The officers of the All College Senate shall consist of a chairman and a secretary.

Section 2: The president of the college shall preside as chairman. In his absence the Dean for Academic Affairs shall preside.

Section 3: The secretary shall be selected from within the All College Senate membership and shall serve as such for only one year. The duties of the secretary shall be to record the proceedings of the meetings.

Article V. Meetings

The All College Senate shall meet at least once each month during the academic year. Meetings shall alternate between days and evenings.

Article VI. Amendments

An amendment to this constitution may be adopted by means of a two thirds majority vote by the representatives.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Through the review of current literature, discussion with members of the campus community and review of the current governance system at Castleton State College, a proposal in the form of a constitution was designed and developed for an All College Senate. The All College Senate proposal was designed so all major factions on campus would be included in its membership. As Mortimer and McConnell (1978) believed, shared authority was an ideal that all colleges should strive for and could only become a reality through an organization such as the All College Senate. Through the encompassing of all groups, cooperation and communications would be enhanced and, thus, the mission of the college would be carried forward.

Objectives of the proposal were designed to identify those areas that should be included in and, most importantly, excluded from the organizations deliberations. As Desmarais and Wiggins (1975), Millet (1978), and Weaver (1977) cited such an organization should not replace either the faculty or student associations, nor any collective bargaining units, but must parallel them.

By identifying the objectives of the organization all members of the campus community would be cognizant of its parameters and that it would not infringe upon special interest groups. Thus, a resultant loss of identity and freedom in areas such as negotiation between employers and employees would be prevented. Also, the student organization would be free to disperse its funds as it desired for approved student clubs and recreational purposes.

The membership was constructed to include major groups who had an interest in the mission and goals of the college. These groups included evening, part time as well as day students. In the past evening and part time students have had no voice or input into campus affairs nor matters that directly affected them. Most evening students have outside commitments that preclude them from attending full time or during the day. By including them in the All College Senate they would bring a different and, thus, a much broader perspective to issues concerning the college than many of the younger full time, day students. As Desmarais and Wiggins (1975) and Chalick, et al (1976) opined, if the part time or evening student was not included in the governance structure than the largest constituency on campus was disenfranchised.

Clerical, secretarial, maintenance and other non contract personnel have also been disenfranchised in the past. Their needs, concerns and input had not been sought nor considered. By including them, as well as the alumni, an added depth and dimension would be brought to all discussions than previously had been possible.

The method for choosing representatives was considered to be a vital issue. Many writers believed that the representatives must be chosen by a means that would give a true sense of legitimacy to the organization (Chalick, et al, 1974; Millet, 1978; Shaffer, 1970). Representatives should either be elected or appointed by their constituencies. The Faculty Assembly, Student Association, and non contract personnel group would elect their representatives. Where as, the diversity of the alumni was such that the decision of who should serve was finally left to the discretion of the college president. The representative from the ranks of the administrators was also considered as the president's decision.

The term of membership, after the first year, would be for two consecutive years. If the term was less than that, the organization would not be as affective because continuity of purpose would be impossible, or very difficult, from one year to the next if all representatives were newly elected every year. Each representative would serve one term only, than must wait at least two years before being allowed to serve again. The reason for this stipulation was if an individual, such as a faculty member, was continually elected as a representative, other interested individuals may be excluded from serving and, importantly, the depth and breadth of opinions and input would be diminished. Also, the legitimacy of the organization which according to many writers was essential, would than be compromised.

Officers of the organization would be a chairman and recording secretary. The chairman would be the college president and the secretary would be elected by the members of the All College Senate from among the representatives. The individual chosen as secretary would serve for only one year in that capacity. The time limit of serving as secretary was essential because the recording of proceedings of meetings would preclude the individual from entering fully into discussions.

Meetings of the organization must be at least once a month during the academic year and must alternate between days and evenings. The alternating of day and evening meetings would, thus, allow all representatives the opportunity to attend at least part of the time. The evening, part time students usually have other commitments during the day that might preclude them from attending day meetings.

Communications were essential and according to Millet (1978) must be encouraged. If the All College Senate was to truly represent its constit-

uencies and if affective, cooperative decisions were to be made communications to and from the college community must be maintained.

Release time for faculty and staff was included in the proposal because if membership was added to existing duties resentment would be fostered and full participation would suffer. Students, being the least experienced should be considered as embarking upon a learning experience similar to an internship or cooperative program. Therefore, students should receive three college credits, which would equal the one fourth release time given to faculty and staff. Students should not take more than twelve additional credits so they would have the necessary time to research issues and communicate with their constituencies. As the Carnegie Commission (1974) and Shaffer (1970) suggested, students need such an instrument as involvement in campus government to aid in their learning and preparation for community involvement after graduation.

The organization should be truly representative of students, staff and others opinions. McGrath (1970:35) believed that benefits of such participatory governance would 1) give a clear understanding and appreciation of problems of students as part of the administrative and academic process of higher education; 2) be helpful in advising on how orderly and constructive change can occur in higher education and in the larger society; and, 3) give better and faster insights on the purposes and methods of education.

The basic purpose of all educational institutions is learning (young, 1976). Therefore, as a learning experience, students should be involved with the governance of the college. Through interaction with others on the All College Senate, students will gain a better understanding of the decision making process, the college and its mission. By serving on the All College Senate elements exist that would aid in creating a

supportive, educational atmosphere for all members of the senate and the community.

Recommendations from the study were as follows:

1. The first academic year deliberations and decisions by the All College Senate should move slowly as the process would be an educative process for the complete campus. Moving into an All College Senate would be a new experience for the Castleton State College community. To ensure that implementation of the organization would be affective, the first year must be considered as a learning process. Therefore, the All College Senate should more more slowly and deliberatly than it might in future years, with an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses being examined at the end of the first year of operation.

2. No changes should be made in the objectives or number of representatives until after the first academic year and the evaluation of the organization. If changes were allowed to occur before the completion of the first year certain groups may find, or believe, their needs and voices were not being heard; or they may again find themselves disenfranchised.

3. The All College Senate should undertake the preparation of a 'Bill of Rights' for all constituencies on campus. A 'Bill of Rights' has been needed to protect the rights and priviledges of all constituencies. Collective bargaining was voted in by faculty because they believed their rights had been violated. Staff and non contract personnel have recently been moving in that direction for the same reason. A possible reason for students' apathy may be that they also believe their rights have been and continue to be ignored. By the preparation of a 'Bill of Rights' for each constituency perhaps further movement toward unionization or student apathy can be reversed. As Chalick, et al (1974) cited, the preparing and

implementing of a 'Bill of Rights' was an area that should be given priority by a college senate or president's council to ensure that rights and priviledges of all campus groups were protected.

REFERENCES CITED

Astin, Alexander W.
1977 Four Critical Years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Balderston, Frederick.
1974 Managing Today's University. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Blocker, Clyde, Louis Bender, and S.V. Martorana.
1975 The Political Terrain of American Post Secondary Education. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University.

Brubacker, John.
1977 On the Philosophy of Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.
1974 A Digest of Reports of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Chalick, Conrad, Ross Craig and David Heiney.
1974 A study to Determine the Participation of Evening and Part Time Students in the College Governance System. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. ED 103 034.

Chaloux, Bruce.
1975 An Analysis of the Impact of the 1974 Collective Bargaining Agreement on the Organization and Administration of Castleton State College. Unpublished report.

Desmarais, Armand and E. Foster Wiggins.
1975 A Proposed Participatory Governance Structure for the Division of Continuing Education and Community Services at Bristol Community College. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. ED 103 032.

Enerson, Harold L.
1973 "Tinkering with University Government." Educational Record. (Winter):47-50.

Hawes, Leonard and Hugo Trux IV.
1974 "Student Participation in the University Decision-making Process." Journal of Higher Education. (February):123-134.

Helsabeck, Robert.
1973 The Compound System: A Conceptual Framework for Affective Decision Making in Colleges. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. Berkeley.

Hodgkinson, Harold.
1971 College Governance: The Amazing Thing is Tat it Works at All. Report II. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. Washington.

McGrath, Earl.
1970 Should Students Share the Power? Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Mortimer, Kenneth.
1976 The implications of Faculty Collective Bargaining for Administrative Practice and Theory. Y.S., Educational Resources Information Center. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. ED 134 049.

Mortimer, Kenneth and T.R. McConnell.
1978 Sharing Authority Effectively. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Millet, John D.
1978 New Structures of Campus Power. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Richardson, Richard and Louis Bender.
1974 College Governance. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University.

Riley, Gary and J. Victor Baldridge.
1977 Governing Academic Organizations. California: McCutchem.

Skinner, B.F.
1977 "Between Freedom and Despotism." Psychology Today. (September): 80-91.

Shaffer, Jay C.
1970 "Students in the Policy Process." The Journal of Higher Education. (May):341-349.

Weaver, Thomas.
1977 A Profile of Faculty and Administrator Perceptions of a College's Governance Characteristics. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. ED 136 870.

Wyman, Bruce T.
1974 A Descriptive Study of the Semantic Connotations Toward the Institutional Governance System at Delaware County Community College of the Several Constituent Groups. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. ED 099 089.

Young, Jerry.
1969 The Student and Campus Goverance. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. ED 039 873.